

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-17 and rejected same. With this paper, claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 13-14 and 16-17 are amended, claims 11 and 12 are canceled, and new claims 18-30 are added. The application now includes 28 claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102

At paragraph 2 of the Office action, claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-11 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Soliman (US Patent No. 6,671,291).

Soliman relates to a means for synchronizing timing and frequency for a communication network. According to Soliman, the means includes a parent station (i.e. a reference station) which maintains system time and frequency values (i.e. reference signals), a time/frequency transfer unit which receives the system time value from the parent station and generates corrected system time and frequency values, and a child station to which the time/frequency transfer unit directly communicates the corrected system time and frequency values. Soliman states (col. 1, lines 49-52):

“This hierarchy of parent station-time transfer unit-child station-parent station may be repeated for as many stations as are deployed in a given wireless network.” (Emphasis added)

The applicant respectfully submits that, the above remark, together with the detailed descriptions as cited by the examiner, clearly shows that Soliman only teaches synchronizing timing and frequency between base stations within a given wireless network (i.e. using same wireless standard). In contrast, the applicants’ invention involves two stations that belong to two different telecommunication networks (i.e. using different wireless standards), and the proper means for achieving time and frequency synchronization between the two stations. Therefore, the applicant believes that Soliman does not anticipate the applicant’s invention.

With this response, claim 1 and 17 are amended to incorporate limitations of claim 12 to indicate that the claimed invention is appropriate where two base

stations are from different networks, and 12 is now canceled. Some other claims depending on the claim 1 are also amended accordingly. Claim 11, which refers to the cancelled matter of claim 1, is now cancelled.

Since the independent claim 1 as amended is believed to be patentable at least for the reasons given above, applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 USC §102(e) of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Correspondingly, claim 17 is also believed to be patentable as amended. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 USC §102(e) of claim 17 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The applicant also requests rejections under 35 USC §102(e) of claims 2-5, 7-8, 10 and 16, all of them dependent claims of claim 1, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

The examiner rejected following claims under 35 USC §103(a):

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Soliman in view of Toda (US Patent No. 5,448,570).

Claims 12 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Soliman in view of Bauchot (US Patent No. 6,141,336).

Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Soliman in view of Gass (US Patent No. 4,774,704).

Regarding the rejection to claim 12, the examiner acknowledges that the feature of previously presented claim 12 (the first base station and the second base station are from different radio telecommunication network) is not taught in Solimon, but asserts that Bauchot (US Patent No. 6,141,336) teaches this feature and thus claim 12 is unpatentable over Soliman in view of Bauchot. The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's assertion in this regard. In the passage referred to by the examiner (col. 2 lines 61-65), Bauchot states:

"Accordingly, in a digital communication system comprising a first network based on an asynchronous transfer mode and comprising at least one asynchronous terminal, a second network based on a synchronous transfer mode and"

Although Bauchot teaches a system comprising two networks (i.e. an asynchronous one and a synchronous one), there is no indication that the networks are "radio" networks. In fact, Bauchnot teaches away from the solution of one radio network using information obtained from another separate radio network, since Bauchot's solution is based on the idea that both the asynchronous and synchronous networks utilize a shared radio channel (see for example: col. 3 lines 58-60; col. 4, lines 14-16; col. 5, lines 15-17 of Bauchot).

Reading Bauchot as a whole it is clear that the solution is instead concerned with different communication protocols (which Bauchot refers to as "networks") having a single radio network, controlled by single scheduling entity, and the "compatibility" mentioned by the Examiner (at lines 3-4 on page 5 of the Office Action) does not exist.

The applicant respectfully submits that, first, the combination of Soliman and Bauchot does not teach the features of the amended independent claims. Second, inter alia, the combination of these references is improper since a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to make such a combination since there would be no "compatibility."

Since independent claim 1, now amended to incorporate limitations of previous claim 12, is believed to be allowable for the reasons given above, applicant respectfully requests that the above rejection based on claim 12 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Further, the applicant respectfully requests the rejections under 35 USC §103(a) of other claims, being dependent on claim 1, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are now in condition for allowance, and their passage to issue is earnestly

solicited. Applicant's attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

28 Feb 05
Date

Ware, Fressola, van der Sluys & Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224
Tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955

Respectfully submitted,

Francis J. Maguire

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391